<div align="center">Remarks</div>

Claims 25, 31, and 37 have been amended. Claims 25-37 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claims 25, 31, and 37 have each been amended to make clear that the position and size of the non-DirectDraw region is dynamically determined by "monitoring and intercepting function calls made by the shared application to a graphical display subsystem" (emphasis added). Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 25, lines 18-21 of the application.

<div align="center">Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103</div>

Claims 25-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Boss et al. (U.S. 5,758,110) and in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 25 is patentable because neither Boss nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests "monitoring and **intercepting** function calls made by the shared application **to a graphical display subsystem** to dynamically determine a position and a size of a non-DirectDraw region of a window displayed in a presenter screen for a shared application" (emphasis added). Rather, the sensor application 107 of Boss intercepts display driver calls made by the graphical device interface 102 to the display drive 104 (see column 4, lines 49-58). Figure 3 of Boss clearly shows the sensor application 107 intercepting display driver calls made by the graphical user interface (GDI) 102 to the display driver 104, and not function calls made by the Windows application 101 to the GDI 102. Display driver calls made by the GDI 102 to the display driver 104 are different from function calls made by a shared application to a graphical display subsystem. Therefore, Boss does not meet the scope of the claim limitation of determining the position and size of the non-DirectDraw region by **intercepting** function calls made by the shared application **to** the graphical display subsystem, as specifically required by claim 25. The AAPA does not disclose, teach or suggest this deficiency in Boss.

<div align="center">8</div>

Further, neither Boss nor the AAPA, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggest employing different techniques to determine the position and size of different graphics regions of a window for a shared application. The method of claim 25 employs different techniques for determining the position and size of the non-DirectDraw region and the DirectDraw region of the window for the shared application. For the non-DirectDraw region, the claimed method monitors and intercepts function calls made by the shared application to the graphical display subsystem, and, for the DirectDraw region, the claimed method monitors a DirectDraw Com interface. Boss does not teach or suggest employing different techniques to determine the position and size of different graphics regions of a window for a shared application. Rather, Boss uses the same technique for determining the position and size of the entire window for the shared application, which is to intercept display driver calls made by the GDI 102 to the display driver 104. Because neither Boss nor the AAPA discloses, teaches or suggests employing different techniques to determine the position and size of different graphics regions of a window for a shared application, it would not have been obvious to employ different techniques to determine the position and size of the non-DirectDraw region and the DirectDraw region of the window for the shared application, as required by claim 25.

Further, neither Boss not the AAPA, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests determining the position and size of the DirectDraw region by monitoring a DirectDraw COM interface. The previous Office Action did not specifically address why it would have been obvious to monitor the Direct COM interface. To establish *prima facie* obviousness, MPEP § 2143.03 requires that all the claim limitations be taught or suggested by the prior art.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is patentable over the combined teachings of Boss and the AAPA, and requests that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

Claims 26-30 depend from claim 25, and are therefore patentable for the reasons given for claim 25.

Independent claims 31 and 37 each have claim limitations similar to those of claim 25, and are therefore patentable for the reasons given above for claim 25. Claims 32-36 depend from claim 31, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 31.

Conclusion

Prompt and favorable action on the merits of the claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the undersigned can be reached at (949) 567-6700.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: July 28, 2006   By: _Eum W̶a̶l̶_____

                                                              Eugene Worley
                                                              Reg. No. 47,186

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Tel. 949-567-6700
Fax: 949-567-6710

10